PTO/SB/21 (09-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

Application Number

TRANSMITTAL			Application Number	10/700,173 November 3, 2003	
			Filing Date		
			First Named Inventor	Raj K. Gowda	
			Art Unit	3673	
			Examiner Name	Alexander Grosz	
(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)			Attorney Docket Number		
Total Number of Pages in This Submission			7 Morrioy Docker Hamber	35606.00.0002	
ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)					
Extended Info	Fee Attached endment/Reply After Final Affidavits/declaration(s) ension of Time Request press Abandonment Request press Aba	F F F C C C C Remark		ddress	After Allowance Communication to TC Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) Proprietary Information Status Letter Other Enclosure(s) (please Identify below): -return postcard
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT					
Firm Name Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.					
Signature Of Theobour					

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

Reg. No.

34,414

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

the date shown below: Signature

Printed name

Date

Christine A. Wright Typed or printed name

Christopher J. Reckamp

January 3, 2006

January 3, 2006

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.





IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Title: INFLATABLE CUSHION CELL WITH DIAGONAL SEAL STRUCTURE

Serial No.: 10/700,173

Filing Date: November 3, 2003

Confirmation No.: 3662

Examiner: Alexander Grosz

Art Unit: 3673

Docket No.: 35606.00.0002

Certificate of First Class Mailing
I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited with the
United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope
addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents,
P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA, 223 13-1450, on this date

1-3-06

Christine

Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents

P. O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed December 1, 2005, Applicant responds as follows.

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Claims 1-20, 23 and 24 are pending. Claims 21 and 22 have already been withdrawn based on a previous restriction requirement.

The office action attempts to restrict claims to three allegedly different inventions and groups the claims as follows: Group I – Claims 1-12; Group II – Claims 13-16; and Group III – Claims 17-20, 23 and 24. The reason for the alleged distinctness is that the inventions are related as combination and subcombination in that the combination as claimed "does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability." (See Restriction Requirement, page 2). However, Applicant respectfully submits that it appears that the claims have been misapprehended since each of the pending independent claims requires the subcombination of claim 1 and as such, the first element of the test applied in the restriction requirement is not met